arXiv:0805.2233v2 [physics.gen-ph] 3 Nov 2009

Proper time in rotation curves: the MOND CDM connection

Vikram H. Zaveri*
B-4/6, Avanti Apt., Harbanslal Marg, Sion, Mumbai 400022 INDIA

(Dated: Oct. 25, 2009)

Proper times associated with Milky Way's rotation curve have been computed outside the framework of general relativity. It is proposed that the flat Minkowski metric can deviate in different ways for different two body systems. This effect is more pronounced on galactic scale due to large variations in gravitational potential caused by non-uniform distribution of galactic matter. When the proper times of stars which are functions of the deviation factors, and the virial mass of the galaxy are introduced in modified Newtonian dynamics, they yield precise values of circular velocities for the stars of the Milky Way. So the formalism becomes comparable to MOND formalism except that the virial mass is used and the MOND constant acceleration parameter gets replaced by a variable expression related to the proper time. Hence it becomes possible to extract an equivalent variable acceleration parameter which is of the same order of magnitude as the constant MOND parameter. This leads to the conclusion that the MOND theory provides an ad hoc empirical expression for the effect of proper time on Newtonian dynamics. The expression for proper time derived here when introduced in Kepler's third law gives us a modified law that satisfies both the solar system dynamics as well as the galactic rotation curves. The discussion is focused on Milky Way but the theory can be extended to other galaxies. Gravitational redshift of light, bending of light and perihelic precession of planets are within the permissible limits and this part of the theory called the periodic relativity (PR) also satisfy Einstein's field equations. The theory yields a very accurate and precise value for the anomalous acceleration of the Pioneer spacecraft.

PACS numbers: 04.50.+h, 95.35.+d, 98.10.+z, 98.35.Df
Keywords: Modified gravity theory, Galaxy: kinematics and dynamics, Dark matter, Rotation curves.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Solar System, the planets at the outer edge of the system have a lower orbital velocity than those closer to the Sun. When the observations of the rotation rates of the spiral galaxies began in late 70s, it became clear that the galaxies were not rotating in the same manner as the Solar System. Stars near the outer edge of the galaxy were orbiting at the same speed as stars near the middle. Astronomers described this rotation pattern as the "flattening of galaxies' rotation curves". Two group of theories emerged to explain the flattening of rotation curves. One group explained the phenomenon as due to the presence of unseen matter or cold dark matter (CDM) [1, 2, 3] and the other group proposed modification to Newtonian dynamics at very large distances [4, 5, 6, 7, 8].

Some of the related literature on the subject includes following. CDM articles describing universal rotation curves [9], F(R)-gravity model [43], brane world model [10], dark matter distribution [11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 36], scalar-tensor theories [13], gravitational suppression model [14], scaling relations [15], Milky Way rotation curves [18, 19, 20, 28]. No dark matter articles describing MOND theories [4, 22, 23, 24, 25] and other theories [5, 6, 8, 27, 32]. Data articles [20, 21, 29, 30, 31, 33] and test articles [22, 23, 27, 31, 34, 35].

The theory presented in following sections is based on earlier work [37] where I found it necessary to redefine the orbital energy of the body and eliminate weak-field approximation from the solution to Einstein's field equations. In this theory the deviation introduced to flat Minkowski metric (and therefore the proper time of the body) is a free parameter, which can be locked only by experimental measurement of proper time, direct or indirect. Therefore every two body system can deviate differently unlike the general relativity and the proper time of the body becomes a critical parameter like mass, velocity, radial distance etc. When this deviation is small enough as in case of gravitational redshift of light, bending of light and the perihelic precession of planets, the theory can be easily written in a metric form to the first order accuracy. In case of Pioneer anomaly [38] the deviation is much larger but within the range of metric representation. In case of galactic rotation curves these deviations are so large that it is not possible to write this theory in metric form without introducing large errors. This is because the higher order terms cannot be ignored. Therefore the mathematical treatment of the rotation curves part of this theory is more or less like the special relativity.

The theory presented in this paper simultaneously proposes cold dark matter with modified Newtonian dynamics which transits smoothly from short range to long range without abrupt discontinuity and all the parameters of the theory have a physical meaning. In addition, the smallest possible ups and down in what is generally described as the flat rotation curve can be accounted by the theory. The theory can be written in CDM format or MOND format.

---

*Electronic address: cons_eng1@yahoo.com

2. PHYSICS BEHIND THE PRESENT THEORY

In earlier work named the periodic relativity (PR) [37] it was proposed that the time is a periodic phenomenon and can only be defined as period between two events. The most fundamental aspect of time is the period of a wave. We defined a general form of Max Planck's quantum hypothesis applicable to massive particles and derived a relation that showed that when a force acts on a fundamental massive particle, it accelerates the particle and simultaneously alters its associated de Broglie frequency and therefore force consists of two components, the Lorentz force and what we called the de Broglie force responsible for effecting the change in the associated frequency of massive particle [37]. When de Broglie force is ignored, the invariant relationship between force and energy is destroyed. For photon trajectory in a gravitational field, we made use of this de Broglie force component to derive the gravitational redshift of light without making use of the weak field approximation and we made use of the Lorentz force component to derive the deflection of light, again without making use of the weak field approximation. In case of a gross body such as a planet, we can conviniently deal with the Lorentz force but it is not possible to directly account for the de Broglie force. To compensate for this deficiency, we make use of the concept of proper time in PR. Hence PR [37, 38] proposes a definite connection between the proper time of a gross body and the associated de Broglie wavelengths and frequencies of its constituent fundamental particles which are in bound states.

We have the fundamental relations $E = mc^2 = h\nu$.

$$\frac{m}{m_0} = \frac{\nu}{\nu_0} = \frac{dt}{d\tau} = \gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}. \tag{2.1}$$

$$\frac{1}{\nu_0}\frac{d\nu}{dt} = \frac{1}{m_0}\frac{dm}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{dt}{d\tau}\right) = \frac{d\gamma}{dt} \approx \frac{v}{c^2}\frac{dv}{dt}. \tag{2.2}$$

Therefore above relations show that the change in associated de Broglie frequency is same as the change in relativistic mass of the particle. Altered energy level of a body would imply altered relativistic mass of the body. Since in PR, the gravitational attraction exists between the relativistic masses, the attractive force between the two bodies would also be altered. The third term in Eq. (2.2) would imply rate of change in the ratio of the coordinate time and the proper time. The fourth term would imply a rate of change in the flat Minkowski metric and the last term relates all above changes to the rate of change of the velocity.

Single most major difference between PR and the general relativity is that the later allows only one time specific deviation to the flat Minkowski metric which we call the weak field approximation, where as PR allows different deviations to the flat Minkowski metric to suit different two body problems. Therefore there is no such thing as a spacetime fabric or rubber in PR [39].

Now how do we apply these concepts to the problem of 'flat rotation curves'. First we need to imagine how many trillions and trillions of fundamental particles have gone into making of a star. The gravitational potential within the virial radius of a galaxy does not change as uniformly and smoothly as it would in case of a spherically symmetric body such as a star. Every galactic circular radius is associated with a specific gravitational potential which is dependent on the galactic mass distribtion. The state of the associated de Broglie frequencies (or wavelengths) of the individual constituent massive particles (which are in bound state) of the star are directly dependent on the local gravitational potential. This state of the constituent particles of the star defines the deviation to the flat Minkowski metric with respect to the two body system consisting of the center of glactic mass and the star. This in turn fixes a proper time for the star at the given circular radius with respect to the coordinate time of the galactic center. For a particular star in circular orbit there is no frequency shift of constituent particles and therefore the orbital energy is constant but as we move radially to other orbits and other stars we find that they have fixed their proper time in the same manner depending on the local gravitational potential. The energy levels of the galactic stars depend on the associated frequencies of their constituent particles which define the relativistic mass of the star which through Lorentz transformation define the velocity of the star which is dependent on the proper time of the star. Earlier we saw that the gravitational force consists of two components. The Lorentz force and the de Broglie force. In short range galacto dynamics, the Lorentz force dominates and the de Broglie force is negligible. At long range the Lorentz force is negligible and the de Broglie force dominates. This statement when analyzed in terms of proper time will show us in following section that Newton's second law gets altered by a factor equal to square of the ratio of proper time to coordinate time.

3. EQUATIONS OF STELLAR MOTION

A. CDM format

Following is the extention of the theory developed earlier [37] where we introduced deviation to the flat Minkowski metric due to the gravitational field in the form,

$$\left(\frac{dt}{d\tau}\right)^2 = \gamma^{2n} = (1-\beta^2)^{-n}, \tag{3.1}$$

For small values of β and n, Eq. (3.1) can be written in approximate form to first order accuracy as

$$d\tau = dt\left(1 - \frac{nv^2}{2c^2}\right), \tag{3.2}$$

where t is the coordinate time, τ the proper time of the orbiting body and n is a real number. The corresponding line element in polar coordinates is,

$$ds^2 = c^2dt^2 - ndr^2 - nr^2d\theta^2 - n(r^2\sin^2\theta)d\phi^2. \quad (3.3)$$

We showed that the line element Eq. (3.3) satisfies Einstein's field equations for any constant value of n or for $n = 0$. However, for very large values of n, approximate relations given by Eqs. (3.2) and (3.3) are invalid. In previous analysis, we have used $n = 0$ for photon trajectory, $n = 1$ for flat Minkowski metric, $n = 4$ for solar system planets. These values are small enough to allow the metric form Eq. (3.3). In case of Pioneer anomaly, n is of order 10^5 which is reasonably small when β^2 is of order 10^{-9} and metric representation is permissible. In case of Milky Way rotation curves as we will see, n is of order 10^6 and β^2 is of order 10^{-7} and if Eqs. (3.2) and (3.3) are used, they would introduce large errors. Therefore we will restrict our use to Eq. (3.1). Under the circumstances we also conclude that the theory developed below cannot satisfy Einstein's field equations even if n is a constant of circular orbit.

In our earlier analysis [37] of perihelic precession of planets, we developed the modified Newtonian dynamics expression

$$\frac{d^2\mathbf{r}}{dt^2} = -\frac{\mu}{r^2}\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \frac{\phi(t)}{r}\hat{\mathbf{r}}. \quad (3.4)$$

We can use Eq. (3.1) to introduce proper time in Eq. (3.4).

$$\frac{d^2\mathbf{r}}{d\tau^2} = -\frac{\mu}{r^2}\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{(1-n)}\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \frac{\phi(\tau)}{r}\hat{\mathbf{r}}. \quad (3.5)$$

Here $\phi(t)$ is the gravitational potential w.r.t. the coordinate system of the galaxy and $\phi(\tau)$ is the gravitational potential w.r.t. the coordinate system of the star.

Since the transverse component of the gravitational acceleration is absent in the polar coordinate system of the central potential, we can write

$$\frac{d^2\mathbf{r}}{d\tau^2} = \left(\frac{d^2r}{d\tau^2} - \frac{h^2}{r^3}\right)\hat{\mathbf{r}}. \quad (3.6)$$

$$\left(\frac{d^2r}{d\tau^2} - \frac{h^2}{r^3}\right)\hat{\mathbf{r}} = -\frac{\mu}{r^2}\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{(1-n)}\hat{\mathbf{r}}. \quad (3.7)$$

For circular orbits we have

$$\frac{d^2r}{d\tau^2} = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad h = vr. \quad (3.8)$$

Substitution of Eq. (3.8) in Eq. (3.7) gives

$$-\frac{v^2}{r} = -\frac{\mu}{r^2}\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{(1-n)}. \quad (3.9)$$

Eq. (3.9) can be written in the logarithmic form as

$$\ln\left(\frac{v^2r}{\mu}\right) = \ln\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right) - n\ln\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right). \quad (3.10)$$

From Eq. (3.10) we get the expression for n

$$n = \left[1 - \frac{\ln\left(\frac{v^2r}{\mu}\right)}{\ln\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)}\right]. \quad (3.11)$$

Substitution of Eq. (3.11) in Eq. (3.1) gives the expression for proper time

$$d\tau = dt\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{n/2}. \quad (3.12)$$

When virial mass and circular velocities are introduced in Eq. (3.11) it gives deviation factor n and proper time interval $d\tau$ which corresponds to the CDM theory.

1. *CDM MOND connection*

In order to relate the CDM theory of sec.3A with the MOND formalism we can write Eq. (3.9) in the form

$$\frac{v^2}{r} = \frac{GM_D}{r^2}\left(\frac{M_v}{M_D}\right)\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{(1-n)}, \quad (3.13)$$

where M_v is the virial mass (halo mass) and M_D is the stellar mass (disk mass).

$$\frac{v^4}{r^2}\left[\frac{v^2}{r}\left(\frac{M_v}{M_D}\right)\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{(1-n)}\right]^{-1} = \frac{GM_D}{r^2}. \quad (3.14)$$

The L.H.S. of Eq. (3.14) is equivalent to the MOND expression and therefore we can write

$$\frac{v^4}{r^2}\left[\frac{v^2}{r}\left(\frac{M_v}{M_D}\right)\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{(1-n)}\right]^{-1} \equiv \xi\left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)a. \quad (3.15)$$

$$\xi\left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)a = \frac{a^2}{a_0\sqrt{1 + (a/a_0)^2}}. \quad (3.16)$$

$$a^2\left[\frac{v^2}{r}\left(\frac{M_v}{M_D}\right)\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{(1-n)}\right]^{-1} = \frac{a^2}{a_e}. \quad (3.17)$$

Therefore the expression a_e is equivalent to the MOND function $a_m = a_0\sqrt{1 + (a/a_0)^2}$. This means that if we replace the MOND function by a_e, both CDM and MOND theories would yield precisely the same rotation curves with same proper time intervals. In addition, the arbitrary MOND function will now have a physical meaning. Some of the difficulties encountered by MOND in fitting the Milky Way curve near solar radius [23, 26] gets eliminated. Same can be said about NGC3198 and clusters of galaxies [40].

With respect to rotation curves of other galaxies, if one knows the stellar mass M_D [4], the virial mass $M_v = M_D + M_h$ can be computed using the relation given by Shankar et al. [36]. Here M_h is the halo mass.

$$M_D = 2.3 \times 10^{10} M_\odot \frac{[M_h/(3 \times 10^{11} M_\odot)]^{3.1}}{1 + [M_h/(3 \times 10^{11} M_\odot)]^{2.2}} \qquad (3.18)$$

From Eqs. (3.17) and (3.12) we can write

$$a_e = \frac{v^2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{-n} \left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right) \frac{M_v}{M_D}. \qquad (3.19)$$

$$a_e = \frac{a}{(d\tau/dt)^2} \left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right) \frac{M_v}{M_D}. \qquad (3.20)$$

$$a_e \approx \frac{a}{(d\tau/dt)^2} \frac{M_v}{M_D}. \qquad (3.21)$$

Eq. (3.21) provides partial justification to the MOND claim that Newtons second law gets modified in the deep MOND range. But there is no justification for the presence of the mass ratio M_v/M_D. In the central bulge of the galaxy, factor $(dt/d\tau)^2(M_v/M_D)$ seems to remain close to unity which would mean that there is no violation of Newton's second law. In outer flat disk area, this factor deviates from unity implying violation of Newton's second law. Looking at it from CDM point of view, there is no violation of Newton's second law when the velocity and acceleration are computed in proper time of the star and there is no need of introducing the ratio M_v/M_D. This would also mean that the line of sight velocities of stars measured by the astrophysicists using Doppler shifts of their spectral features are actually the velocities measured in proper time of the stars.

2. *Proper time intervals of stars in Milky Way*

In this section we apply the equations of stellar motion developed in previous section to Blue Horizontal-Branch (BHB) halo stars of the Milky Way [19]. The circular velocity estimates are based on Naab's simulation [41] for which Xue et al [19] obtained virial mass $M_v = 1.12 \pm 0.17 \times 10^{12} M_\odot$ corresponding to the adiabatically contracted NFW profile. To this data, one additional data point for solar radius of $8 kpc$ [26] is added and the results are shown in Table I. The first thing we notice is that for all values of r, n is negative implying that time runs faster and faster as one moves away from the glalactic center till the peak velocity is attained on the rotation curve. From here as r increases there is slight drop in the velocity which corresponds to the slowing down of time. Secondly, functions a_e and a_m are of the same order of magnitude and a_e provides the perfect fit which a_m cannot.

TABLE I: Milky Way data shows time running faster at solar radius by 3.5 times and slows down at larger radii. a_e and a_m in m/s^2. CDM format.

$r(kpc)$	$v(km/s)$	n	$d\tau/dt$	$a_e \times 10^{10}$	$a_m \times 10^{10}$
7.5	216	−5051271	3.71	3.22	2.34
8.0	220	−4681268	3.527	3.466	2.29
12.5	227	−3509342	2.73	3.93	1.796
17.5	179	−6032730	2.93	1.519	1.34
22.5	168	−6452233	2.75	1.18	1.267
27.5	183	−4440256	2.287	1.66	1.263
32.5	143	−8705548	2.69	0.618	1.217
37.5	170	−4639096	2.108	1.236	1.225
42.5	183	−3271979	1.84	1.66	1.227
47.5	165	−4341245	1.93	1.096	1.214
55	183	−2580035	1.61	1.66	1.216

3. *Kepler's third law*

There is a considerable difference between the proper time given by Eq. (3.12) and that given by the general relativity formula for Keplerian circular orbits.

$$d\tau(gr) = dt \left(1 - \frac{3\mu}{2c^2 R}\right). \qquad (3.22)$$

If we put $n = 3$ and $v^2 = \mu/R$ in Eq. (3.12) we get Eq. (3.22) implying that GR would allow only one fixed value for n for all kind of two body problems. This is what we call the weak field approximation. This is how GR locks the proper time in the theory which is based on the near earth observations. As long as the proper time data for distant objects are not available, no one can question the validity of GR. The present theory also has the same adavantage. With respect to all Milky Way data points given in Table I, ratio $d\tau/dt$ given by GR is approximately of order $(1 - 10^{-6})$ which is almost unity and instead of time running faster with increasing velocities, it actually runs slow.

Coming back to the argument that the line of sight velocities of stars measured by the astrophysicists using Doppler shifts of their spectral features are actually the velocities measured in proper time of the stars. This fact also clearly shows up in Eqs. (3.7), (3.8) and (3.9) where $v = ds/d\tau$. Since Newtonian acceleration is $a = (v^2/r)$ and with such a large ratios for $d\tau/dt$ as given in Table I, at first glance it would appear that Newton's second law is violated. If one were to use GR value of proper time which is based on Kepler's third law, one would hardly notice any effect on Newton's second law. However, it is well established that the spiral galaxy rotation curves do not fall off as predicted by Kepler's third law. Now Kepler's third law has to do with the orbital period of the body and therefore the time. Hence the study of rotation curves basically tells us that our understanding of time is not perfect. Towards this goal if we were to rewrite Kepler's third law in PR we can make use of Eqs. (3.9) and (3.12) to obtain

$$v^2 = \frac{4\pi^2 r^2}{P^2(\tau)} = \frac{4\pi^2 r^2}{P^2(t)}\left(1-\frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{-n} = \frac{\mu}{r}\left(1-\frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{(1-n)}, \tag{3.23}$$

$$P^2(\tau) = \frac{4\pi^2 r^3}{\mu}\left(1-\frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{(n-1)}, \tag{3.24}$$

$$P^2(t) = \frac{4\pi^2 r^3}{\mu}\left(1-\frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{-1} \approx \frac{4\pi^2 r^3}{\mu}, \tag{3.25}$$

where $P(\tau)$ and $P(t)$ are the orbital periods in proper time and coordinate time respectively. Therefore the data corresponding to the solar radius in Table I and with the virial mass of the Milky Way, Eq. (3.24) yields 223.4 million years for the orbital period of the sun around the galactic center. For $n = 4$ for the solar system, Eq. (3.24) yields Kepler's third law as a close approximation. For all small values of n, $P(\tau) \approx P(t)$.

B. MOND format

If a resourceful theory comes along and shows that the dark matter cannot exist and MOND is the best option, then if we were to look for a proper time signature of MOND, the equations can have following forms. If one were to choose Eq. (3.4) for introducing the MOND function Eq. (3.16), the MOND theory would remain as it is today and there cannot be any discussion of proper time. If one introduces Eq. (3.16) in Eq. (3.5) instead, the equations would be as follows.

$$\xi\left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)a = \frac{a^2}{a_0\sqrt{1+(a/a_0)^2}} = \frac{\mu}{r^2}\left(1-\frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)^{(1-n)}. \tag{3.26}$$

$$\ln\left[\frac{v^4}{a_0\mu}\left(1+\frac{v^4}{r^2a_0^2}\right)^{-1/2}\right] = \ln\left(1-\frac{v^2}{c^2}\right) - n\ln\left(1-\frac{v^2}{c^2}\right). \tag{3.27}$$

$$n = \left[1 - \frac{\ln\left[\frac{v^4}{a_0\mu}\left(1+\frac{v^4}{r^2a_0^2}\right)^{-1/2}\right]}{\ln\left(1-\frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)}\right]. \tag{3.28}$$

The proper time expression remains same as Eq. (3.12). Values obtained from Eqs. (3.28) and (3.12) for BHB halo stars of the Milky Way are shown in Table II. The Milky Way stellar mass used [18, 42] is $5.0924\times10^{10}M_\odot$. Value of n remains positive near solar radius and frequently changes sign mainly due to the empirical nature of function $\xi(a/a_0)$. The time ratio $d\tau/dt$ remains closer to unity in contrast with the CDM format. Two theories present sharp contrast at shorter range. In MOND format the abrupt transition from very short range to long range cannot be eliminated. In CDM format this transition is smooth and continuous.

TABLE II: Milky Way data with MOND equations show time running slower than in CDM theory. MOND format.

$r(kpc)$	$v(km/s)$	n	$d\tau/dt$
7.5	216	610460	0.853
8.0	220	762648	0.814
12.5	227	1365558	0.676
17.5	179	354588	0.938
22.5	168	−230011	1.03
27.5	183	732196	0.87
32.5	143	−2973816	1.4
37.5	170	25579	0.996
42.5	183	810578	0.86
47.5	165	−336138	1.05
55	183	834207	0.85

4. CONCLUSION

In PR we have proposed that the flat Minkowski metric can deviate in different ways for different two body systems. The theory is at variance with the formalism of proper time used by general relativity. In PR the proper time of a body is associated with the gravitational frequency shift of the constituent fundamental particles of the body. The frequency shift changes the energy level of the body and alters its relativistic mass which gets reflected in its motion. This effect is more pronounced on galactic scale due to large variations in gravitational potential caused by non-uniform distribution of galactic matter. When the proper times of stars which are functions of the deviation factors, and the virial mass of the galaxy are introduced in modified Newtonian dynamics, they yield precise values of circular velocities for the stars of the Milky Way. So the formalism becomes comparable to MOND formalism except that the virial mass is used and the MOND parameter a_m gets replaced by a variable expression a_e related to the proper time. These two parameters are of the same order of magnitude. This leads to the conclusion that the MOND theory provides an ad hoc empirical expression for the effect of proper time on Newtonian dynamics. The expression for proper time derived here when introduced in Kepler's third law gives us a modified law that satisfies both the solar system dynamics as well as the galactic rotation curves.

The theory weighs heavily towards the CDM theory but theories such as MOND cannot be conclusively ruled out without direct or indirect experimental verification of the predicted proper times shown in Tables I & II. Gravitational redshift of light, bending of light and perihelic precession of planets are within the permissible limits [37] and this part of the theory also satisfy Einstein's field equations. The theory yields a very accurate and precise value for the anomalous acceleration of the Pioneer spacecraft [38].

---

[1] V. C. Rubin, Science (ISSN 0036-8075), vol. 220, 1339, (1983).
[2] L. Bergström, Rep. Prog. Phys., 63, 793, (2000).
[3] G. Bertone, D. Hooper, J. Silk, Phys. Rep., 405, 279, (2005).
[4] R. H. Sanders, S. S. McGaugh, Ann. Rev. Astrophys., 40, 263, (2002).
[5] S. Capozziello, V. F. Cardone, A. Troisi, MNRAS, 375(4), 1423, (2007).
[6] C. F. Martins, P. Salucci, *Analysis of rotation curves in the framework of R^n gravity*, MNRAS, arXiv:astro-ph/0703243.
[7] J. C. Fabris, J. P. Campos, arXiv:0710.3683v1[astro-ph].
[8] N. M. B-Roder, H. Dehnen, G. R. and Gravitation, 39(8), 1259-1277, (2007), arXiv:0801.4842v1[gr-qc].
[9] P. Salucci, A. Lapi, C. Tonini, G. Gentile, I. Yegorova, U. Klein, MNRAS, arXiv:astro-ph/0703115v2.
[10] A. Viznyuk, Y. Shtanov, Phys. Rev., D76, 064009, (2007), arXiv:0706.0649v2[gr-qc].
[11] D. G. Banhatti, arXiv:astro-ph/0703430v2.
[12] G. Gentile, P. Salucci, U. Klein, D. Vergani, P. Kalberla, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc., 351, 903, (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0403154v1.
[13] J. L. C-Cota, M. A. R-Meza, D. Nunez, J. Phys.: Conf. Series: VII, arXiv:0707.2692v1[astro-ph].
[14] C. F. Martins, P. Salucci, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 151301, (2007), arXiv:hep-ph/0611028v2.
[15] P. Salucci, A. Burkert, ApJ. Lett., arXiv:astro-ph/0004397v1.
[16] P. Salucci, A. Lapi, C. Tonini, G. Gentile, I. Yegorova, U. Klein, MNRAS, arXiv:astro-ph/0703115v2.
[17] C.Sivaram, V. M. Reddy.A, arXiv:0710.4384v1 [astro-ph].
[18] X. Wu, B. Famaey, G. Gentile, H. Perets, HS. Zhao, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., arXiv:0803.0977v1[astro-ph].
[19] X.-X. Xue, H.-W. Rix, G. Zhao, P. R. Fiorentin, T. Naab, M. Steinmetz, F. C. van den Bosch, T. C. Beers, Y. S. Lee, E. F. Bell, C. Rockosi, B. Yanny, H. Newberg, R. Wilhelm, X. Kang, M. C. Smith, D. P. Schneider, ApJ., arXiv:0801.1232v3[astro-ph].
[20] G. Battaglia, A. Helmi, H. Morrison, P. Harding, E. W. Olszewski, M. Mateo, K. C. Freeman, J. Norris, S. A. Shectman, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc., 364 (2005) 433-442; Erratum-ibid. 370 (2006) 1055, arXiv:astro-ph/0506102v2.
[21] F. C. van den Bosch, B. E. Robertson, J. J. Dalcanton, W.J.G de Blok, Astron. J., 119, 1579-1591, (2000), arXiv:astro-ph/9911372v1.
[22] E. Corbelli, P. Salucci, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc., 374, 1051-1055, (2007), arXiv:astro-ph/0610618v1.
[23] B. Famaey, J. Binney, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc., 363, 603-608, (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0506723v2.
[24] M. Milgrom, R. H. Sanders, arXiv:astro-ph/0611494v1.
[25] R.H. Sanders, arXiv:astro-ph/0601431v2.
[26] F. Eisenhauer, R. Schoedel, R. Genzel, T. Ott, M. Tecza, R. Abuter, A. Eckart, T. Alexander, Astrophys. J., 597, L121-L124, (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0306220v1.
[27] L. Iorio, M. L. Ruggiero, arXiv:0711.0256v2[gr-qc].
[28] O. Gerhard, *Matter in the Universe*, eds. P. Jetzer, K. Pretzl, R. von Steiger, Space Science Reviews, Kluwer, arXiv:astro-ph/0203110v1.
[29] M. Steinmetz et al., Astronomical Journal, arXiv:astro-ph/0606211v1.
[30] M. Persic, P. Salucci, F. Stel, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc., 281, 27, (1996), arXiv:astro-ph/9506004v3.
[31] C. Heymans et al., Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc.Lett., 371, L60-L64, (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0606418v1.
[32] R. V. Nieuwenhove, arXiv:0712.1110v3[physics.gen-ph].
[33] N. P. Vogt, M. P. Haynes, T. Herter, R. Giovanelli, Astron. J., 127, 3273-3329, (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0402649v2.
[34] G. Gentile, A. Burkert, P. Salucci, U. Klein, F. Walter, arXiv:astro-ph/0506538v4.
[35] G. Gentile, A. Burkert, P. Salucci, U. Klein, F. Walter, Astrophys.J. 634, L145-L148, (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0510607v1.
[36] F. Shankar, A. Lapi, P. Salucci, G. De Zotti, L. Danese, Astrophys. J., 643, 14, (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0601577v2.
[37] V. H. Zaveri, *Periodic invariant, general relativity predictions and origin of universe*. Accepted for publication in Gen. Rel. Grav. arXiv:0707.4539v5 [physics.gen-ph].
[38] V. H. Zaveri, *Pioneer anomaly: a drift in the proper time of the spacecraft*, arXiv:0709.3690v5[physics.gen-ph].
[39] M. J. Francis, L. A. Barnes, J. B. James, G. F. Lewis, 2007, arXiv:0707.0380v1[astro-ph].
[40] J. D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D, 70, 083509, arXiv:astro-ph/0403694, (2004).
[41] Naab, T., et al., ApJ, 658, 710N, (2007).
[42] A. C. Robin et al., A&A, 409, 523, (2003).
[43] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, arXiv:0801.4843v1[astro-ph].